

# MAPLE PARK AND VICTORY HEIGHTS

## Advisory Council for the Dutch Boy Site & Former West Pullman Works Site

**\* The following is a Summary, meant to capture the essence of  
the discussion at the January 20, 1999 Advisory Council meeting.  
It is not meant to serve as a transcript of the proceedings \***

The twentieth meeting of the Maple Park and Victory Heights Advisory Council for the Dutch Boy site and the Former West Pullman Works site, formerly known as International Harvester, was held at the Edward White Elementary School, 1130 South 122nd Street on January 20, 1999 from 7-9 p.m. A synopsis of the meeting follows:

### **I) WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION OF THE AGENDA**

- 1) Welcome and Introductions
- 2) Review of November 4, 1998 meeting summary
- 3) Review any unfinished business/discussions from 11/4 meeting
- 4) Dutch Boy Site Update & Superfund Jobs Training Initiative
- 5) Former West Pullman Works Site Update
- 6) City of Chicago Update

#### **Attendees included:**

##### U.S. EPA

Noemi Emeric, Public Affairs  
Derrick Kimbrough, Public Affairs  
Brad Bradley, Superfund Division

##### IEPA

Vicky Moy, Site Project Manager  
Mark Britton, Community Relations

##### Former West Pullman Works Site Team

Gail Walker, EnviroCom  
Martin Hamper, Geragthy & Miller

##### City of Chicago Dept. of Environment

Renante Marante, Enviro. Coordinator

##### Community Representatives

Leonard Turner	Sarah Parran
Ardis Williams	Abbas Hassain
R.C. Hardy	Dannessee Flennoy

*\* Other persons may have attended, but were unable to sign the sign-in sheet.*

The facilitator, Derrick Kimbrough, opened the meeting, conducted introductions and reviewed the agenda items.

## **II. REVIEW OF MEETING SUMMARY**

- No changes were suggested. The meeting summary was acceptable and the Council will file in the information repository.

## **III. REVIEW ANY UNFINISHED BUSINESS FROM 11/4 MEETING**

- *Access Agreements for the Dutch Boy off-site sampling?* Leonard Turner agreed to follow up with Tony Davenport to ensure Brad Bradley, USEPA, receives the agreements by the next meeting date.
- *Letter to the City and Navistar to discuss participation in negotiation meetings?* Leonard Turner also agreed to follow up with Tony Davenport on the status of the letter.
- *Cost estimates for members* questioned the accountability with Navistar and has requested not only how much will the cleanup cost, but what has been spent to date and by whom? Because Navistar is not receiving money (i.e. grant or tax increment) from State they are not required to release their financial statements.
- *How are cleanup costs being split between City and Navistar?* City is currently using money from the Sherwin Williams supplemental environmental project (SEP) to clean up the West Pullman Works site. None of the \$20 million from the HUD loan is being spent on this site.
- *How much was the Sherwin Williams SEP?* The total grant to the City of Chicago was \$950,000.
- *Will Navistar have to share its financial statements with the City regarding cleanup work at the West Pullman site?* Yes, Navistar plans to share this information with the City, therefore, when the City receives this information it will be public information and accessible to Council members.

## **IV. DUTCH BOY SITE UPDATE**

- Brad Bradley, Remedial Project Manager for the site, discussed three points. The first issue is the discussion of the 1,400 parts per million (ppm) clean up level. Mr. Bradley stated that 1,400 ppm is an industrial clean up level standard. The potentially responsible parties (PRPs) in the 60% design report stated they intend to clean up the site to a 1,400 ppm average. Mr. Bradley stated this is inconsistent with how EPA cleans up other sites across the nation and intends to have discussions with the PRPs regarding this issue. Neither the City of Chicago Dept. of Environment or TOSC wants them to average the clean up to 1,400 ppm.
- Secondly, some of the underground storage tanks (USTs) may have contained linseed oil. If so, the tanks will not have to be removed. Nevertheless, EPA is requesting the PRPs investigate further because the petroleum residue points to possible inconsistencies. If petroleum or any other hazardous substance was stored in the tanks, they will have to be removed.
- Lastly, Mr. Bradley discussed that the PRPs 60% design report did not contain adequate cost estimates for the operation and maintenance (O&M) which is required once the site is cleaned. The O&M will include ensuring the concrete paved area is maintained. EPA plans to have discussions with the PRPs and the City to possibly have the concrete areas removed particularly since the City has

expressed an interest in redeveloping the site.

- EPA has received all comments on the 60% design report. Mr. Bradley will submit a letter to the PRPs to finalize the report with all comments received from TOSC, City and State.
- EPA will facilitate discussions between PRPs and City regarding the removal of the concrete slabs on the site. The City would like the concrete removed and the area underneath cleaned in order to market the site for redevelopment.
- *Will the City oversee the work NL is conducting at the site?* EPA will provide the oversight at the site. Nevertheless, the City will be in the area watching site activities because they are interested in redeveloping the site in the future.
- *Did EPA obtain floor plans of the site from the City or the fire department? A Council member suggested sub-level basements may exist?* EPA will request National Lead provide a more thorough report of the site's history, specifically requesting information on sub-level basements.
- *Are there underground pipes on the site which contain lead and asbestos?* Investigations conducted to date by National Lead's contractors does not indicate that underground pipes or such structures still remain at the site under the concrete area.
- *What does the 60% design report mean?* When contractors provide EPA reports for the work which will be done at the site, instead of having them finalize and provide all the details they provide a draft of what is expected (i.e. this is the 60%). Once EPA agrees to the concept, the contractors will move on to finalizing the report providing a 95% draft final for review and comment before the work begins.
- *Does EPA anticipate problems with NL's contractors conducting the cleanup work?* NL is funding the project, therefore, problems would not be anticipated. Additionally, were EPA to conduct the cleanup, it would cost more due to wage requirements. EPA is providing oversight of the contractor's work, therefore, conflicts may arise which can take time to resolve, but this is not expected.
- *Have any documents been signed which states NL will conduct the necessary cleanup work?* The only signing was by EPA of the Unilateral Administrative Order. NL did not sign the document, nevertheless, the signed Order by EPA basically forces NL to clean the property. If NL were to decline or stop the cleanup they can be fined up to \$25,000 a day. PRPs generally do not agree to the Order, they simply state or sign that they intend to comply with the Order, which is what happened at this site with NL. The Unilateral Order allows NL to try and recoup the funds they spent from other companies who may be liable or from the Superfund Trust Fund.

### **SUPERFUND JOBS TRAINING INITIATIVE (SuperJTI)**

- Noemi Emeric, US EPA, discussed the SuperJTI program which the agency has an interest in implementing at the Dutch Boy site. Ms. Emeric stated the program which started about three years ago seeks to provide training to citizens living near a Superfund site. The program was started in response to concerns raised by communities which bear the brunt of the impacts from a Superfund site, but do not participate in the economic benefits, i.e., many cleanup companies hire people

from outside the community. The training provided through SuperJTI is tailored for the community, and can consist of life skills training for people who may have not been steadily employed previously, health and safety training, lead and asbestos abatement training, etc. The goal of SuperJTI is for individuals completing the training to compete for jobs available at the site or for other environmental job opportunities in the community and with local firms. In order to provide the SuperJTI training, EPA has partnered with the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS). NIEHS manages a worker and minority worker training program. They provide grants through EPA funds to organizations across the country to provide environmental training. DePaul University is an NIEHS grantee who provides training to the six Midwest states which encompass EPA Region 5. DePaul combines a rigorous environmental curriculum with critical thinking skills. DePaul will seek assistance from the community with recruitment and possibly to conduct portions of the life skills training.

- *How long will training last?* Anywhere from 4-8 weeks and 6-8 hours a day.
- *What type of assurance can be given to the training participants that they will receive jobs?* There is no guarantee the participants will receive jobs, nevertheless, DePaul will provide assistance for employment and will work with the participants to teach them mechanisms for interacting with companies and employability skills. Additionally, DePaul will pay for the state certifications needed for environmental employment (i.e. lead and asbestos certifications).
- *Who will provide necessary equipment for training and the potentially new jobs?* DePaul will provide the participants with work boots, physical exams, if needed and other necessary items.
- *Can they release the participants information to contractors at the Former West Pullman Works site for potential employment?* G. Walker stated she would pass along the information when received.

## V. FORMER WEST PULLMAN WORKS SITE UPDATE

- *A Council member asked how the City's ownership of the site will impact the cleanup effort?* Renante Marante, City of Chicago Department of Environment, stated the City's ownership of the site would not preclude the site from being cleaned up as planned before the City acquired the property.
- The Sherwin-Williams settlement provided the City money for activities such as outreach, not for the actual cleanup of the Former West Pullman Works.
- Council members questioned why Navistar has not provided financial information regarding the cost of the site remediation project. *Will the financial information become available when it is submitted to the City in the cost-sharing agreement?* Mr. Hamper responded that Navistar's contribution to the project will become public information upon release of the cost-sharing agreement with the City.
- *Are there underground tunnels running between the Dutch Boy site and the Former West Pullman Works?* A Council member produced a site map that he said had been provided to him by the Chicago Fire Department. The Council member indicated that the Dutch Boy site may have subsurface structures. Mr. Hamper stated the project team has not seen any information indicating underground tunnels connect the two sites. Mr. Hamper reviewed the map

- provided by the Council member and stated it is which his company has viewed.
- Mr. Hamper reported that the Subsurface Investigation document has been submitted to Illinois EPA for review.
  - *A Council member asked if the fence surrounds the entire Former West Pullman Works?* Yes, the abandoned properties which are located next to the site are not considered part of the site. The site includes the entire area within the boundaries of the fence.
  - G. Walker reported that all significant matters have been agreed to in principle regarding the cost-sharing agreement, that the text has been drafted and the City attorneys are reviewing the text. The cost-sharing agreement encompasses issues related to the tunnel investigation, surface debris, underground storage tanks, subsurface contamination, site remediation program and community relations.
  - *A Council member asked how long the City attorneys would take to review the draft agreement?* The general response was that the agreement should be finalized by Spring and when weather permits, the work will begin. Mr. Marante stated the City's goal is to obtain a No Further Remediation letter from Illinois EPA by the end of 1999.

## **VI. CITY OF CHICAGO SITE UPDATE**

- Mr. Marante stated the Department of Public Health hired Ed Adler to work with the Department of Environment on the City's Brownfields sites.
- Mr. Marante also discussed that the City received ownership of the Amforge property through a tax reactivation program and/or demolition lien in December, 1998. When the weather permits, the City will conduct further investigations to determine if any asbestos exists on the property from the demolition.
- *A Council member inquired about the City's status on purchasing two properties, Chicago Cutting Authority and Harbor Tools?* Mr. Marante stated the City has not purchased the two sites, but they have received an access agreement to conduct a Phase II investigation. The City will not pursue purchase until the Phase II results are received.
- *A Council member questioned who conducted the Phase I site investigation at the Amforge site?* Mr. Marante replied Harza Environmental conducted the multi-site Phase I site investigation in 1996 and Black and Veath conducted the Phase II site investigation June 1998.
- *A Council member asked if the Amforge site reports and investigation results were able for viewing at the information repositories?* Mr. Marante stated he was not sure if the reports were available, nevertheless, if the reports are not available he will provide copies for the repositories.

## **VII. ACTION ITEMS, AGENDA TOPICS & DATES FOR UPCOMING MEETINGS**

- **Action Items**
  - ✓ Access Agreements to EPA for off-site residential soil sampling – Tony

Davenport

- ✓ Letter to Navistar and City requesting attendance at negotiation meetings as observers and/or participants – Tony Davenport /Advisory Council
- The next meeting has been scheduled for **Wednesday, April 28, 1999 from 7-9 pm** at the Edward White School.
- Questions, comments and/or amendments regarding this meeting summary will be taken and discussed at the beginning of the next meeting (April 28). The amendments will be made at the next meeting with the corrected meeting summary placed in the information repository after the meeting date. The summary was prepared by the USEPA, IEPA, the City of Chicago Department of Environment and the contractors for Navistar, Geragthy & Miller and EnviroCom.